

2012 MAY - 4 P 4: 05

## ORDER

### Legal Standard

-1-

Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* review of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court is not required to “review [the] magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under *de novo* review or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985).

### **Discussion**

In this matter before the Court, Plaintiff asserted that the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) failed to consider the combined effects of his spinal abnormalities, which the ALJ found to be “severe”, and his diagnosis of depression. The Magistrate Judge noted in her Report and Recommendation that while the ALJ performed an “in-turn consideration of [the Plaintiff’s] multiple impairments”, he did not adequately consider the combined effects of these conditions, as mandated by *Walker v. Bowen*, 889 F.2d 47, 49-50 (4th Cir. 1989). (Dkt. No. 25 at 13-16). On this basis, the Magistrate Judge recommended the decision of the Commissioner be reversed and remanded. The Commissioner has filed no objection to this recommendation.

The Court has reviewed the ALJ’s decision, the full record in this matter, the Report and Recommendation, and the applicable case. The Court finds much merit in the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation and hereby **ADOPTS** it as the Order of the Court. The decision of the Commissioner is hereby **REVERSED** and **REMANDED** pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further action consistent with this Order.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Judge

Charleston, South Carolina  
May 8, 2012